

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

**In re Application of:**

Robert M. Japp et al.

Serial No.: 09/625,135

**Filed: July 25, 2000**

**For: Composite Laminate Circuit  
Structure and Methods of  
Fabricating**

1  
 2  
 3  
 4  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525

Art Unit: 3729

Examiner: Anthony D. Tubang.

Atty Docket: END919990082US1

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 22 2007

# OFFICIAL

**APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF**

Attention: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is an appeal from the Primary Examiner's final rejection of claims 8-17 and in response to the Notification of Non-Compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) dated June 24, 2004.

## I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is the assignee of the application, International Business Machines Corporation

## II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellant, Appellant's legal representative, or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

### III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-17 are in the application. Claims 8-17 are finally rejected and are on appeal. Claims 1-7 are directed to a non-elected invention and have been withdrawn.

### IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment has been filed after final rejection.

### V. SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The present invention relates to methods for fabricating laminate circuit structures, and more particularly to fabricating composite laminate circuit structures constructed from a plurality of modularized circuitized voltage plane subassemblies bonded together. The present invention provides for planar, fine line external circuit flat lines and does not require an additional adhesive sheet or glass cloth reinforcement (page 1, lines 6-14 of the specification and figure 3).

The present invention makes possible thinner laminate circuit structures, and therefore making possible higher density PCBs with fewer processing steps. The subject invention teaches new ways to form 2S1P (figure 1) and 0S1P (figure 2) components using novel methods, some of which also simplify or solve problems of how to adhere these components together into a composite, in some cases without the corresponding increase in composite thickness necessitated by the prior art (page 2, line 30 to page 3, line 2 of the specification).

The present invention improves and simplifies the process for customizing the power planes as well as opening up numerous new possibilities in methods to construct the component cores (page 3, lines 5-7 of the specification). The present invention comprises novel ways for adhering together the subassemblies (page 3, lines 8-9 of the specification, figures 4 and 5).

More particularly, claim 8 relates to a method for fabricating a laminate circuit structure assembly (page 4, lines 12-13 of the specification and figure 3).

The method comprises providing at least two modularized circuitized voltage plane subassemblies wherein each of the subassemblies comprise at least two signal planes disposed about an internal voltage plane (page 4, lines 13-15 and page 17, lines 27-29 of the specification and figure 1).

The signal planes each have an external surface and an internal surface (page 4, lines 15-16 of the specification and figure 1).

Dielectric material is located between the signal and voltage planes (page 4, lines 16-17 and page 17, lines 27-29 of the specification and figure 1) and also on each external surface of each signal plane (page 4, line 19 and page 17, line 29 of the specification and figure 1).

An uncured or partially cured curable dielectric composition is located between the subassemblies (page 4, lines 20-21 of the specification). The dielectric composition comprises the same dielectric used in the subassemblies (page 3, lines 29-30 of the specification).

Optionally, an interposer can be located between the subassemblies wherein the interposer comprises dielectric layers that are disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer (page 4, lines 26-28 of the specification). The subassemblies are aligned and laminated to cause bonding of the subassemblies (page 4, lines 29-30 of the specification and figure 4).

Claim 9 further recites locating an interposer between the subassemblies wherein the interposer comprises dielectric layers disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer (page 4, lines 26-28 of the specification). Claim 10 further recites that the dielectric of at least one of the surfaces that is to be bonded is from said dielectric composition (page 20 and original claim 10). Claim 11 further recites that vias are disposed within each subassembly for providing electrical communication between signal planes and electrical connection to another subassembly (page 7, line 30, page 9, line 12, page 17, lines 29 and 30 and figures 1 and 3). Claim 12 further recites that the vias through the signal planes are plated with a conductive metal page 7, lines 30 and 31, page 17, lines 30 and 31 and figure 1). Claim 13 further recites that the vias are filled with conductive adhesive (page 17, lines 30 and 31 and figure 1). Claim 14 further recites that the internal electricity conductive layer of the interposer is copper (page 21, original claim 14). Claim 15 further recites that the interposer is about 3 to about 10 mils thick (page 21, original claim 15). Claim 16 further recites providing top and bottom circuit layers on top and bottom external surfaces of the assembly (page 21, original claim 16 and figure 3). Claim 17 further recites that the laminating is carried out at about 100 to about 200°C, for about 15 minutes to about 90 minutes, and at a pressure of about 100 to about 500 psi (page 17, lines 13-15, page 21, original claim 17).

## VI. ISSUES

- A. Has the examiner established that Claims 8, 11-13 and 16 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 4,868,350 to Hoffarth, et al.?
- B. Has the examiner established that Claims 9, 10, 14 and 15 are obvious and therefore unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Hoffarth et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,755,911 to Suzuki?
- C. Has the examiner established that Claim 17 is obvious and therefore unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Hoffarth in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,788,766 to Burger, et al.?

## VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For each rejection of the claims, the involved claims stand or fall together.

## VIII. ARGUMENTS

A. U.S. Patent No. 4,868,350 to Hoffarth, et al. fails to anticipate Claims 8, 11-13 and 16

Claims 8, 11-13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,868,350 to Hoffarth, et al. (hereinafter also "Hoffarth"). Hoffarth fails to anticipate Claims 8, 11-13 and 16.

By way of background as discussed in the specification, a conventional technique of forming a laminate circuit board structures includes forming layers of dielectric material and electrically conducting material to provide multiple layers of circuits and voltage planes. Voltage planes can be either ground plane or power planes, and are sometimes collectively referred to as power planes (page 1, lines 16-20 of the specification).

Composites constructed using 2S1P building blocks offer a number of advantages over conventional construction techniques. One of these advantages is testable impedance prior to composite lamination. The impedance is also predominately controlled by the core dielectric. This is a major advantage as core layer dielectrics are not effected by the complex geometries and fill requirements that occur at composite lamination. 2S1P's built with glass cloth free materials facilitate very high circuit density by allowing very small, laser drilled holes to be made. One very important aspect of using 2S1P's to build high density composite printed circuit

boards (PCBs) is the method used to adhere the 2S1P's into a composite board (page 2, line 29—page 3, line 3 of the specification).

Prior methods of making 2S1P cores involve drilling or etching clearance holes in bare sheets, e.g., 2 oz., 1 oz. and/or .5 oz., copper and then laminating and fully curing these with conventional prepregs or coated foils to produce a core that could be circuitized forming the signal planes. Likewise, prior OS1P's have been fabricated in similar manners. These methods are difficult to practice due to the problems associated with handling bare copper. 2S1P's can also be made by circuitizing one side of a core with the power pattern then relaminating additional prepreg or coated copper over the circuitized power pattern (page 3, lines 4–11 of the specification).

Regardless of the method used to make the 2S1P cores, they must now be stuck together using additional "sticker" materials placed between the 2S1P's and the OS1P's. These additional sticker sheets contribute additional thickness and exacerbate all the problems associated with additional thickness (page 3, lines 12–15 of the specification).

More recently, techniques have been provided that provide a relatively inexpensive photolithographic technique of forming a composite laminate structure from individual discrete laminate structures into a composite laminate structure (page 3, lines 16–18 of the specification).

The present invention, as discussed above, provides an improved process.

Hoffarth fails to anticipate Claims 8, 11–13 and 16 since, among other things, Hoffarth does not suggest employing a dielectric composition between the sub-assemblies that is of the same material as the dielectric of the sub-assemblies. Hoffarth merely suggests employing low dielectric constant material for sub-assemblies and low dielectric material for the encapsulant binding layer, but does not disclose that such should be of the same material. The dielectric material of the subassemblies of Hoffarth is shown as sheets 12 and 12b. The other dielectric material employed in Hoffarth is that used for the encapsulant binding layer and dielectric between cores as shown in figure 4. However, neither of these dielectric materials are disclosed as necessarily being the same as the dielectric of the subassemblies as required by the present invention. Moreover, Hoffarth does not explicitly state that the encapsulant 11 should even be

the same as the material between subassemblies. In fact, the material of the sub-assemblies is preferably polytetrafluoroethylene (e.g., see Column 4, lines 10-11, Claims 10 and 15), and the encapsulant is preferably epoxy or chlorotrifluoroethylene (e.g., see Column 3, Lines 47-51; Col. 4, lines 27-30). The material mentioned for that between subassemblies is epoxy or chlorotrifluoroethylene.

Moreover, the bonding layers and dielectric of the subassemblies are selected to differ since the binding is to space the dielectric from the conductive surfaces.

Furthermore, Hoffarth does not disclose the step of providing subassemblies having dielectric on each external surface of each signal plane prior to providing a dielectric composition for the laminating as required by the present claims. Hoffarth merely shows subassemblies having signal planes 19 on the encapsulant. The subassemblies or cores are then laminated together with the material for the laminating directly contacting the signal plane.

Therefore, Hoffarth fails to anticipate the above claims. In particular, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a prior art reference, of each and every recitation as set forth in the claims. See *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985), *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, USPQ2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986), and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 USPQ2d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

There must be no difference between the claimed invention and reference disclosure for an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. See *Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genetech, Inc.*, 18 USPQ2d 1001 (CAFC 1991) and *Studiengesellschaft Kohle GmbH v. Dart Industries*, 220 USPQ 841 (CAFC 1984).

The law is well settled that claiming of a more specific range within a more generic range and/or claiming species from a broader group of possible compounds avoids a lack of novelty rejection. The test for anticipation is whether the claims read on the prior art disclosure, not on what the reference broadly teach.

For example, see *Akzo v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 USPQ2d 241 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In *Akzo*, the claims that were drawn to a process for making aramid fibers using a

98% sulfuric acid were not anticipated by a reference using a concentrated sulfuric acid solution. The disclosure of a concentrated sulfuric acid was not deemed an inherent disclosure of the more specific 98% sulfuric acid.

The court further found that no anticipation exists when one would have had to "randomly pick and choose among a number of different polyamides, a plurality of solvents and a range of inherent viscosities" to reach the claimed invention.

Also see *In re Kollman*, et al. 201 USPQ 193 (CCPA-1979) wherein the court held that the prior art generic disclosure contains "no suggestion of the required FENAC/diphenyl ether ratio."

*In Rem-Cru Titanium v. Watson* 112 USPQ 88 (D.D.C-1956), the prior art showed alloys having broad ranges which included the claimed ranges. However, the prior art did not explicitly disclose the more limited ranges or alloys having the characteristics of the claimed alloy, which is analogous to the present case. Accordingly, the court held the claims to be allowable. For a similar factual pattern and same holding, please see *Becket v. Coe* (CA, DC 1938) 38 USPQ2d and *Tarak v Watson* (DC-DC 1954) 103 USPQ 78.

Also, see *Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Ortho-Pedics, Inc.* 24 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Here the court held that although the claims may be subsumed in a prior art reference generalized disclosure, this is not literal identity. The reference ranges were "so broad as to be meaningless" and provided no guidelines on how to construct a product with the invention's attributes.

Furthermore, the cited references do not inherently disclose the present invention. For instance, see *In re Robertson, et al* 49 USPQ2d 1949 (1999 Fed. Cir.). In this case, Robertson filed a patent application concerning a paper diaper. The application claimed a paper diaper having (a) two fasteners so that the diaper could be worn on a baby and (b) a third fastener for rolling up and fixing the used diaper. The Patent Office rejected the invention under 35 USC 102 based on "Principles of Inherency" as the invention is "anticipation" by the prior art.

The prior art (Wilson) relied upon disclosed a diaper which had two snaps in front and back of the diaper in order to be worn by a baby and which may further have a strip in order to fasten the diaper to baby's body. Wilson describes that the used diaper can be easily dealt with by rolling up and fixing it with the snaps. Accordingly, the Patent Office considered that the diaper of Wilson inherently has an ability to be rolled up and fixed after use and decided that the claimed diaper is anticipated by the diaper of Wilson. The Federal Circuit; however, held that it is recognized that the constitution of the invention is inherently present in the prior art, only when it is clearly shown that the constitution of the invention is necessarily present in the prior art by external evidence. The invention can not be rejected based on "inherency" because of probability or possibility of the presence of the constitution in the prior art. Also see *Crown Operations International Ltd. V. Solutia* 24 USPQ 2d 1917 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

B. Hoffarth et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,755,911 to Suzuki does not render obvious Claims 9, 10, 14 and 15.

Claims 9, 10, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffarth et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,755,911 to Suzuki. Suzuki fails to overcome the above discussed deficiencies of Hoffarth with respect to rendering unpatentable the present claims.

Suzuki does not suggest an interposer comprising dielectric layers disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer as recited in these claims. Moreover, Suzuki does not relate to laminating subassemblies of the type to which the claims are directed. Instead, the layers 2, 3 and 4 in Suzuki are actually circuit boards not interposes between subassemblies. Also, Suzuki requires employing a porous, expanded polytetrafluoroethylene to bond the circuit boards together. Moreover, Suzuki requires adhesive dots to bond the PTFE, which is contrary to the objectives of the present invention.

Accordingly, even if, Suzuki were combined with Hoffarth, the present invention would still not be disclosed.



C. Hoffarth in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,788,766 to Burger, et al. does not render obvious Claim 17.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hoffarth in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,788,766 to Burger, et al. Burger, et al. was relied upon for a disclosure of laminating subassemblies employing temperatures of at least 155°C, a time of 15 minutes and a pressure of 125 psi.

Burger, et al. fail to overcome the above discussed deficiencies of Hoffarth with respect to rendering unpatentable the present invention. Therefore Claim 17 is patentable for at least those reasons as to why Claim 8 is patentable.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is abundantly clear that the Primary Examiner erred in finally rejecting claims 8-17. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Board reverse the Examiner and allow claims 8-17.

In the event the Examiner deems necessary any further cooperation to further the prosecution of this application, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fees to Deposit Account 22-0185.

Dated: 7-22-04

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Burton A. Amernick

Registration No.: 24,852

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800

Washington, DC 20036-3425

(202) 331-7111

(202) 293-6229 (Fax)

Attorneys for Applicant

## APPENDIX – CLAIMS ON APPEAL

8. A method for fabricating a laminate circuit structure assembly which comprises: providing at least two modularized circuitized voltage plane subassemblies wherein each of the subassemblies comprise at least two signal planes having an external and internal surface disposed about an internal voltage plane; providing dielectric between the signal and voltage planes; and providing dielectric on each external surface of each signal plane; and providing a non-cured or partially cured curable dielectric composition between the subassemblies wherein the dielectric composition comprises, the same dielectric used in said subassemblies, aligning the subassemblies, and then laminating to cause bonding of the subassemblies.

9. The method of Claim 8, which further comprises: locating an interposer between the subassemblies wherein the interposer comprises dielectric layers disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer.

10. The method of Claim 9, wherein dielectric of at least one of the surfaces that is to be bonded is from said dielectric composition.

11. The method of Claim 8, wherein vias are disposed within each subassembly for providing electrical communication between signal planes and electrical connection to another subassembly.

12. The method of Claim 11, wherein the vias through the signal planes are plated with a conductive metal.

13. The method of claim 11, wherein the vias are filled with conductive adhesive.

14. The method of Claim 9, wherein the internal electricity conductive layer of the interposer is copper.

15. The method of Claim 9, wherein the interposer is about 3 to about 10 mils thick.

16. The method of Claim 8, which comprises: providing top and bottom circuit layers on top and bottom external surfaces of the assembly.

17. The method of Claim 8, wherein the laminating is carried out at about 100 to about 200°C, for about 15 minutes to about 90 minutes, and at a pressure of about 100 to about 500 psi.

OFFICIAL

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

**In re Application of:**

Robert M. Japp et al.

**Serial No.: 09/625,135**

**Filed: July 25, 2000**

**For: Composite Laminate Circuit  
Structure and Methods of  
Fabricating**

1  
 2  
 3  
 4  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525

Art Unit: 3729

**Examiner: Anthony D. Tubang.**

Atty Docket: END919990082US1

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 22 2004

APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

Attention: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is an appeal from the Primary Examiner's final rejection of claims 8-17 and in response to the Notification of Non-Compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) dated June 24, 2004.

## I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is the assignee of the application, International Business Machines Corporation

## II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellant, Appellant's legal representative, or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

### III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-17 are in the application. Claims 8-17 are finally rejected and are on appeal. Claims 1-7 are directed to a non-elected invention and have been withdrawn.

### IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment has been filed after final rejection.

### V. SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The present invention relates to methods for fabricating laminate circuit structures, and more particularly to fabricating composite laminate circuit structures constructed from a plurality of modularized circuitized voltage plane subassemblies bonded together. The present invention provides for planar, fine line external circuit flat lines and does not require an additional adhesive sheet or glass cloth reinforcement (page 1, lines 6-14 of the specification and figure 3).

The present invention makes possible thinner laminate circuit structures, and therefore making possible higher density PCBs with fewer processing steps. The subject invention teaches new ways to form 2S1P (figure 1) and 0S1P (figure 2) components using novel methods, some of which also simplify or solve problems of how to adhere these components together into a composite, in some cases without the corresponding increase in composite thickness necessitated by the prior art (page 2, line 30 to page 3, line 2 of the specification).

The present invention improves and simplifies the process for customizing the power planes as well as opening up numerous new possibilities in methods to construct the component cores (page 3, lines 5-7 of the specification). The present invention comprises novel ways for adhering together the subassemblies (page 3, lines 8-9 of the specification, figures 4 and 5).

More particularly, claim 8 relates to a method for fabricating a laminate circuit structure assembly (page 4, lines 12-13 of the specification and figure 3).

The method comprises providing at least two modularized circuitized voltage plane subassemblies wherein each of the subassemblies comprise at least two signal planes disposed about an internal voltage plane (page 4, lines 13-15 and page 17, lines 27-29 of the specification and figure 1).

The signal planes each have an external surface and an internal surface (page 4, lines 15–16 of the specification and figure 1).

Dielectric material is located between the signal and voltage planes (page 4, lines 16–17 and page 17, lines 27–29 of the specification and figure 1) and also on each external surface of each signal plane (page 4, line 19 and page 17, line 29 of the specification and figure 1).

An uncured or partially cured curable dielectric composition is located between the subassemblies (page 4, lines 20–21 of the specification). The dielectric composition comprises the same dielectric used in the subassemblies (page 3, lines 29–30 of the specification).

Optionally, an interposer can be located between the subassemblies wherein the interposer comprises dielectric layers that are disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer (page 4, lines 26–28 of the specification). The subassemblies are aligned and laminated to cause bonding of the subassemblies (page 4, lines 29–30 of the specification and figure 4).

Claim 9 further recites locating an interposer between the subassemblies wherein the interposer comprises dielectric layers disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer (page 4, lines 26–28 of the specification). Claim 10 further recites that the dielectric of at least one of the surfaces that is to be bonded is from said dielectric composition (page 20 and original claim 10). Claim 11 further recites that vias are disposed within each subassembly for providing electrical communication between signal planes and electrical connection to another subassembly (page 7, line 30, page 9, line 12, page 17, lines 29 and 30 and figures 1 and 3). Claim 12 further recites that the vias through the signal planes are plated with a conductive metal page 7, lines 30 and 31, page 17, lines 30 and 31 and figure 1). Claim 13 further recites that the vias are filled with conductive adhesive (page 17, lines 30 and 31 and figure 1). Claim 14 further recites that the internal electricity conductive layer of the interposer is copper (page 21, original claim 14). Claim 15 further recites that the interposer is about 3 to about 10 mils thick (page 21, original claim 15). Claim 16 further recites providing top and bottom circuit layers on top and bottom external surfaces of the assembly (page 21, original claim 16 and figure 3). Claim 17 further recites that the laminating is carried out at about 100 to about 200°C, for about 15 minutes to about 90 minutes, and at a pressure of about 100 to about 500 psi (page 17, lines 13–15, page 21, original claim 17).

## VI. ISSUES

- A. Has the examiner established that Claims 8, 11-13 and 16 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 4,868,350 to Hoffarth, et al.?
- B. Has the examiner established that Claims 9, 10, 14 and 15 are obvious and therefore unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Hoffarth et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,755,911 to Suzuki?
- C. Has the examiner established that Claim 17 is obvious and therefore unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Hoffarth in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,788,766 to Burger, et al.?

## VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For each rejection of the claims, the involved claims stand or fall together.

## VIII. ARGUMENTS

### A. U.S. Patent No. 4,868,350 to Hoffarth, et al. fails to anticipate Claims 8, 11-13 and 16

Claims 8, 11-13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,868,350 to Hoffarth, et al. (hereinafter also "Hoffarth"). Hoffarth fails to anticipate Claims 8, 11-13 and 16.

By way of background as discussed in the specification, a conventional technique of forming a laminate circuit board structures includes forming layers of dielectric material and electrically conducting material to provide multiple layers of circuits and voltage planes. Voltage planes can be either ground plane or power planes, and are sometimes collectively referred to as power planes (page 1, lines 16-20 of the specification).

Composites constructed using 2S1P building blocks offer a number of advantages over conventional construction techniques. One of these advantages is testable impedance prior to composite lamination. The impedance is also predominately controlled by the core dielectric. This is a major advantage as core layer dielectrics are not effected by the complex geometries and fill requirements that occur at composite lamination. 2S1P's built with glass cloth free materials facilitate very high circuit density by allowing very small, laser drilled holes to be made. One very important aspect of using 2S1P's to build high density composite printed circuit

boards (PCBs) is the method used to adhere the 2S1P's into a composite board (page 2, line 29—page 3, line 3 of the specification).

Prior methods of making 2S1P cores involve drilling or etching clearance holes in bare sheets, e.g., 2 oz., 1 oz. and/or .5 oz., copper and then laminating and fully curing these with conventional prepregs or coated foils to produce a core that could be circuitized forming the signal planes. Likewise, prior OS1P's have been fabricated in similar manners. These methods are difficult to practice due to the problems associated with handling bare copper. 2S1P's can also be made by circuitizing one side of a core with the power pattern then relaminating additional prepreg or coated copper over the circuitized power pattern (page 3, lines 4—11 of the specification).

Regardless of the method used to make the 2S1P cores, they must now be stuck together using additional "sticker" materials placed between the 2S1P's and the OS1P's. These additional sticker sheets contribute additional thickness and exacerbate all the problems associated with additional thickness (page 3, lines 12—15 of the specification).

More recently, techniques have been provided that provide a relatively inexpensive photolithographic technique of forming a composite laminate structure from individual discrete laminate structures into a composite laminate structure (page 3, lines 16—18 of the specification).

The present invention, as discussed above, provides an improved process.

Hoffarth fails to anticipate Claims 8, 11-13 and 16 since, among other things, Hoffarth does not suggest employing a dielectric composition between the sub-assemblies that is of the same material as the dielectric of the sub-assemblies. Hoffarth merely suggests employing low dielectric constant material for sub-assemblies and low dielectric material for the encapsulant binding layer, but does not disclose that such should be of the same material. The dielectric material of the subassemblies of Hoffarth is shown as sheets 12 and 12b. The other dielectric material employed in Hoffarth is that used for the encapsulant binding layer and dielectric between cores as shown in figure 4. However, neither of these dielectric materials are disclosed as necessarily being the same as the dielectric of the subassemblies as required by the present invention. Moreover, Hoffarth does not explicitly state that the encapsulant 11 should even be



the same as the material between subassemblies. In fact, the material of the sub-assemblies is preferably polytetrafluoroethylene (e.g., see Column 4, lines 10-11, Claims 10 and 15), and the encapsulant is preferably epoxy or chlorotrifluoroethylene (e.g., see Column 3, Lines 47-51; Col. 4, lines 27-30). The material mentioned for that between subassemblies is epoxy or chlorotrifluoroethylene.

Moreover, the bonding layers and dielectric of the subassemblies are selected to differ since the binding is to space the dielectric from the conductive surfaces.

Furthermore, Hoffarth does not disclose the step of providing subassemblies having dielectric on each external surface of each signal plane prior to providing a dielectric composition for the laminating as required by the present claims. Hoffarth merely shows subassemblies having signal planes 19 on the encapsulant. The subassemblies or cores are then laminated together with the material for the laminating directly contacting the signal plane.

Therefore, Hoffarth fails to anticipate the above claims. In particular, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a prior art reference, of each and every recitation as set forth in the claims. See *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985), *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, USPQ2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986), and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 USPQ2d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

There must be no difference between the claimed invention and reference disclosure for an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. See *Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genetech, Inc.*, 18 USPQ2d 1001 (CAFC 1991) and *Studiengesellschaft Kohle GmbH v. Dart Industries*, 220 USPQ 841 (CAFC 1984).

The law is well settled that claiming of a more specific range within a more generic range and/or claiming species from a broader group of possible compounds avoids a lack of novelty rejection. The test for anticipation is whether the claims read on the prior art disclosure, not on what the reference broadly teach.

For example, see *Akzo v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 USPQ2d 241 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In *Akzo*, the claims that were drawn to a process for making aramid fibers using a

98% sulfuric acid were not anticipated by a reference using a concentrated sulfuric acid solution. The disclosure of a concentrated sulfuric acid was not deemed an inherent disclosure of the more specific 98% sulfuric acid.

The court further found that no anticipation exists when one would have had to "randomly pick and choose among a number of different polyamides, a plurality of solvents and a range of inherent viscosities" to reach the claimed invention.

Also see *In re Kollman*, et al. 201 USPQ 193 (CCPA-1979) wherein the court held that the prior art generic disclosure contains "no suggestion of the required FENAC/diphenyl ether ratio."

*In Rem-Cru Titanium v. Watson* 112 USPQ 88 (D.D.C-1956), the prior art showed alloys having broad ranges which included the claimed ranges. However, the prior art did not explicitly disclose the more limited ranges or alloys having the characteristics of the claimed alloy, which is analogous to the present case. Accordingly, the court held the claims to be allowable. For a similar factual pattern and same holding, please see *Becket v. Coe* (CA, DC 1938) 38 USPQ2d and *Tarak v Watson* (DC-DC 1954) 103 USPQ 78.

Also, see *Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Ortho-Pedics, Inc.* 24 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Here the court held that although the claims may be subsumed in a prior art reference generalized disclosure, this is not literal identity. The reference ranges were "so broad as to be meaningless" and provided no guidelines on how to construct a product with the invention's attributes.

Furthermore, the cited references do not inherently disclose the present invention. For instance, see *In re Robertson, et al* 49 USPQ2d 1949 (1999 Fed. Cir.). In this case, Robertson filed a patent application concerning a paper diaper. The application claimed a paper diaper having (a) two fasteners so that the diaper could be worn on a baby and (b) a third fastener for rolling up and fixing the used diaper. The Patent Office rejected the invention under 35 USC 102 based on "Principles of Inherency" as the invention is "anticipation" by the prior art.

The prior art (Wilson) relied upon disclosed a diaper which had two snaps in front and back of the diaper in order to be worn by a baby and which may further have a strip in order to fasten the diaper to baby's body. Wilson describes that the used diaper can be easily dealt with by rolling up and fixing it with the snaps. Accordingly, the Patent Office considered that the diaper of Wilson inherently has an ability to be rolled up and fixed after use and decided that the claimed diaper is anticipated by the diaper of Wilson. The Federal Circuit, however, held that it is recognized that the constitution of the invention is inherently present in the prior art, only when it is clearly shown that the constitution of the invention is necessarily present in the prior art by external evidence. The invention can not be rejected based on "inherency" because of probability or possibility of the presence of the constitution in the prior art. Also see *Crown Operations International Ltd. V. Solutia* 24 USPQ 2d 1917 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

**B. Hoffarth et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,755,911 to Suzuki does not render obvious Claims 9, 10, 14 and 15.**

Claims 9, 10, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffarth et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,755,911 to Suzuki. Suzuki fails to overcome the above discussed deficiencies of Hoffarth with respect to rendering unpatentable the present claims.

Suzuki does not suggest an interposer comprising dielectric layers disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer as recited in these claims. Moreover, Suzuki does not relate to laminating subassemblies of the type to which the claims are directed. Instead, the layers 2, 3 and 4 in Suzuki are actually circuit boards not interposes between subassemblies. Also, Suzuki requires employing a porous, expanded polytetrafluoroethylene to bond the circuit boards together. Moreover, Suzuki requires adhesive dots to bond the PTFE, which is contrary to the objectives of the present invention.

Accordingly, even if, Suzuki were combined with Hoffarth, the present invention would still not be disclosed.

C. Hoffarth in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,788,766 to Burger, et al. does not render obvious Claim 17.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hoffarth in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,788,766 to Burger, et al. Burger, et al. was relied upon for a disclosure of laminating subassemblies employing temperatures of at least 155°C, a time of 15 minutes and a pressure of 125 psi.

Burger, et al. fail to overcome the above discussed deficiencies of Hoffarth with respect to rendering unpatentable the present invention. Therefore Claim 17 is patentable for at least those reasons as to why Claim 8 is patentable.

Conclusion


In view of the above, it is abundantly clear that the Primary Examiner erred in finally rejecting claims 8-17. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Board reverse the Examiner and allow claims 8-17.

In the event the Examiner deems necessary any further cooperation to further the prosecution of this application, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fees to Deposit Account 22-0185.

Dated: 7-22-04

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Burton A. Amernick

Registration No.: 24,852  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036-3425

(202) 331-7111  
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)  
Attorneys for Applicant

**APPENDIX – CLAIMS ON APPEAL**

8. A method for fabricating a laminate circuit structure assembly which comprises: providing at least two modularized circuitized voltage plane subassemblies wherein each of the subassemblies comprise at least two signal planes having an external and internal surface disposed about an internal voltage plane; providing dielectric between the signal and voltage planes; and providing dielectric on each external surface of each signal plane; and providing a non-cured or partially cured curable dielectric composition between the subassemblies wherein the dielectric composition comprises, the same dielectric used in said subassemblies, aligning the subassemblies, and then laminating to cause bonding of the subassemblies.

9. The method of Claim 8, which further comprises: locating an interposer between the subassemblies wherein the interposer comprises dielectric layers disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer.

10. The method of Claim 9, wherein dielectric of at least one of the surfaces that is to be bonded is from said dielectric composition.

11. The method of Claim 8, wherein vias are disposed within each subassembly for providing electrical communication between signal planes and electrical connection to another subassembly.

12. The method of Claim 11, wherein the vias through the signal planes are plated with a conductive metal.

13. The method of claim 11, wherein the vias are filled with conductive adhesive.

14. The method of Claim 9, wherein the internal electricity conductive layer of the interposer is copper.

15. The method of Claim 9, wherein the interposer is about 3 to about 10 mils thick.

16. The method of Claim 8, which comprises: providing top and bottom circuit layers on top and bottom external surfaces of the assembly.

17. The method of Claim 8, wherein the laminating is carried out at about 100 to about 200°C, for about 15 minutes to about 90 minutes, and at a pressure of about 100 to about 500 psi.

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

**In re Application of:**

Robert M. Japp et al.

**Serial No.: 09/625,135**

**Filed: July 25, 2000**

**For: Composite Laminate Circuit  
Structure and Methods of  
Fabricating**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
84

Art Unit: 3729

Examiner: Anthony D. Tubang

Atty Docket: END919990082US1

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 22 2004

# OFFICIAL

APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

Attention: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Dear Sir:**

This is an appeal from the Primary Examiner's final rejection of claims 8-17 and in response to the Notification of Non-Compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) dated June 24, 2004.

## I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is the assignee of the application, International Business Machines Corporation

## II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellant, Appellant's legal representative, or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

### III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-17 are in the application. Claims 8-17 are finally rejected and are on appeal. Claims 1-7 are directed to a non-elected invention and have been withdrawn.

### IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment has been filed after final rejection.

### V. SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The present invention relates to methods for fabricating laminate circuit structures, and more particularly to fabricating composite laminate circuit structures constructed from a plurality of modularized circuitized voltage plane subassemblies bonded together. The present invention provides for planar, fine line external circuit flat lines and does not require an additional adhesive sheet or glass cloth reinforcement (page 1, lines 6-14 of the specification and figure 3).

The present invention makes possible thinner laminate circuit structures, and therefore making possible higher density PCBs with fewer processing steps. The subject invention teaches new ways to form 2S1P (figure 1) and 0S1P (figure 2) components using novel methods, some of which also simplify or solve problems of how to adhere these components together into a composite, in some cases without the corresponding increase in composite thickness necessitated by the prior art (page 2, line 30 to page 3, line 2 of the specification).

The present invention improves and simplifies the process for customizing the power planes as well as opening up numerous new possibilities in methods to construct the component cores (page 3, lines 5-7 of the specification). The present invention comprises novel ways for adhering together the subassemblies (page 3, lines 8-9 of the specification, figures 4 and 5).

More particularly, claim 8 relates to a method for fabricating a laminate circuit structure assembly (page 4, lines 12-13 of the specification and figure 3).

The method comprises providing at least two modularized circuitized voltage plane subassemblies wherein each of the subassemblies comprise at least two signal planes disposed about an internal voltage plane (page 4, lines 13-15 and page 17, lines 27-29 of the specification and figure 1).



The signal planes each have an external surface and an internal surface (page 4, lines 15–16 of the specification and figure 1).

Dielectric material is located between the signal and voltage planes (page 4, lines 16–17 and page 17, lines 27–29 of the specification and figure 1) and also on each external surface of each signal plane (page 4, line 19 and page 17, line 29 of the specification and figure 1).

An uncured or partially cured curable dielectric composition is located between the subassemblies (page 4, lines 20–21 of the specification). The dielectric composition comprises the same dielectric used in the subassemblies (page 3, lines 29–30 of the specification).

Optionally, an interposer can be located between the subassemblies wherein the interposer comprises dielectric layers that are disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer (page 4, lines 26–28 of the specification). The subassemblies are aligned and laminated to cause bonding of the subassemblies (page 4, lines 29–30 of the specification and figure 4).

Claim 9 further recites locating an interposer between the subassemblies wherein the interposer comprises dielectric layers disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer (page 4, lines 26–28 of the specification). Claim 10 further recites that the dielectric of at least one of the surfaces that is to be bonded is from said dielectric composition (page 20 and original claim 10). Claim 11 further recites that vias are disposed within each subassembly for providing electrical communication between signal planes and electrical connection to another subassembly (page 7, line 30, page 9, line 12, page 17, lines 29 and 30 and figures 1 and 3). Claim 12 further recites that the vias through the signal planes are plated with a conductive metal page 7, lines 30 and 31, page 17, lines 30 and 31 and figure 1). Claim 13 further recites that the vias are filled with conductive adhesive (page 17, lines 30 and 31 and figure 1). Claim 14 further recites that the internal electricity conductive layer of the interposer is copper (page 21, original claim 14). Claim 15 further recites that the interposer is about 3 to about 10 mils thick (page 21, original claim 15). Claim 16 further recites providing top and bottom circuit layers on top and bottom external surfaces of the assembly (page 21, original claim 16 and figure 3). Claim 17 further recites that the laminating is carried out at about 100 to about 200°C, for about 15 minutes to about 90 minutes, and at a pressure of about 100 to about 500 psi (page 17, lines 13–15, page 21, original claim 17).

## VI. ISSUES

- A. Has the examiner established that Claims 8, 11-13 and 16 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 4,868,350 to Hoffarth, et al.?
- B. Has the examiner established that Claims 9, 10, 14 and 15 are obvious and therefore unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Hoffarth et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,755,911 to Suzuki?
- C. Has the examiner established that Claim 17 is obvious and therefore unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Hoffarth in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,788,766 to Burger, et al.?

## VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For each rejection of the claims, the involved claims stand or fall together.

## VIII. ARGUMENTS

### A. U.S. Patent No. 4,868,350 to Hoffarth, et al. fails to anticipate Claims 8, 11-13 and 16

Claims 8, 11-13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,868,350 to Hoffarth, et al. (hereinafter also "Hoffarth"). Hoffarth fails to anticipate Claims 8, 11-13 and 16.

By way of background as discussed in the specification, a conventional technique of forming a laminate circuit board structures includes forming layers of dielectric material and electrically conducting material to provide multiple layers of circuits and voltage planes. Voltage planes can be either ground plane or power planes, and are sometimes collectively referred to as power planes (page 1, lines 16-20 of the specification).

Composites constructed using 2S1P building blocks offer a number of advantages over conventional construction techniques. One of these advantages is testable impedance prior to composite lamination. The impedance is also predominately controlled by the core dielectric. This is a major advantage as core layer dielectrics are not effected by the complex geometries and fill requirements that occur at composite lamination. 2S1P's built with glass cloth free materials facilitate very high circuit density by allowing very small, laser drilled holes to be made. One very important aspect of using 2S1P's to build high density composite printed circuit

boards (PCBs) is the method used to adhere the 2S1P's into a composite board (page 2, line 29—page 3, line 3 of the specification).

Prior methods of making 2S1P cores involve drilling or etching clearance holes in bare sheets, e.g., 2 oz., 1 oz. and/or .5 oz., copper and then laminating and fully curing these with conventional prepregs or coated foils to produce a core that could be circuitized forming the signal planes. Likewise, prior OS1P's have been fabricated in similar manners. These methods are difficult to practice due to the problems associated with handling bare copper. 2S1P's can also be made by circuitizing one side of a core with the power pattern then relaminating additional prepreg or coated copper over the circuitized power pattern (page 3, lines 4–11 of the specification).

Regardless of the method used to make the 2S1P cores, they must now be stuck together using additional "sticker" materials placed between the 2S1P's and the OS1P's. These additional sticker sheets contribute additional thickness and exacerbate all the problems associated with additional thickness (page 3, lines 12–15 of the specification).

More recently, techniques have been provided that provide a relatively inexpensive photolithographic technique of forming a composite laminate structure from individual discrete laminate structures into a composite laminate structure (page 3, lines 16–18 of the specification).

The present invention, as discussed above, provides an improved process.

Hoffarth fails to anticipate Claims 8, 11–13 and 16 since, among other things, Hoffarth does not suggest employing a dielectric composition between the sub-assemblies that is of the same material as the dielectric of the sub-assemblies. Hoffarth merely suggests employing low dielectric constant material for sub-assemblies and low dielectric material for the encapsulant binding layer, but does not disclose that such should be of the same material. The dielectric material of the subassemblies of Hoffarth is shown as sheets 12 and 12b. The other dielectric material employed in Hoffarth is that used for the encapsulant binding layer and dielectric between cores as shown in figure 4. However, neither of these dielectric materials are disclosed as necessarily being the same as the dielectric of the subassemblies as required by the present invention. Moreover, Hoffarth does not explicitly state that the encapsulant 11 should even be

the same as the material between subassemblies. In fact, the material of the sub-assemblies is preferably polytetrafluoroethylene (e.g., see Column 4, lines 10-11, Claims 10 and 15), and the encapsulant is preferably epoxy or chlorotrifluoroethylene (e.g., see Column 3, Lines 47-51; Col. 4, lines 27-30). The material mentioned for that between subassemblies is epoxy or chlorotrifluoroethylene.

Moreover, the bonding layers and dielectric of the subassemblies are selected to differ since the binding is to space the dielectric from the conductive surfaces.

Furthermore, Hoffarth does not disclose the step of providing subassemblies having dielectric on each external surface of each signal plane prior to providing a dielectric composition for the laminating as required by the present claims. Hoffarth merely shows subassemblies having signal planes 19 on the encapsulant. The subassemblies or cores are then laminated together with the material for the laminating directly contacting the signal plane.

Therefore, Hoffarth fails to anticipate the above claims. In particular, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a prior art reference, of each and every recitation as set forth in the claims. See *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985), *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, USPQ2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986), and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 USPQ2d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

There must be no difference between the claimed invention and reference disclosure for an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. See *Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genetech, Inc.*, 18 USPQ2d 1001 (CAFC 1991) and *Studiengesellschaft Kohle GmbH v. Dart Industries*, 220 USPQ 841 (CAFC 1984).

The law is well settled that claiming of a more specific range within a more generic range and/or claiming species from a broader group of possible compounds avoids a lack of novelty rejection. The test for anticipation is whether the claims read on the prior art disclosure, not on what the reference broadly teach.

For example, see *Akzo v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 USPQ2d 241 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In *Akzo*, the claims that were drawn to a process for making aramid fibers using a

98% sulfuric acid were not anticipated by a reference using a concentrated sulfuric acid solution. The disclosure of a concentrated sulfuric acid was not deemed an inherent disclosure of the more specific 98% sulfuric acid.

The court further found that no anticipation exists when one would have had to “randomly pick and choose among a number of different polyamides, a plurality of solvents and a range of inherent viscosities” to reach the claimed invention.

Also see *In re Kollman*, et al. 201 USPQ 193 (CCPA-1979) wherein the court held that the prior art generic disclosure contains “no suggestion of the required FENAC/diphenyl ether ratio.”

*In Rem-Cru Titanium v. Watson* 112 USPQ 88 (D.D.C-1956), the prior art showed alloys having broad ranges which included the claimed ranges. However, the prior art did not explicitly disclose the more limited ranges or alloys having the characteristics of the claimed alloy, which is analogous to the present case. Accordingly, the court held the claims to be allowable. For a similar factual pattern and same holding, please see *Becket v. Coe* (CA, DC 1938) 38 USPQ2d and *Tarak v Watson* (DC-DC 1954) 103 USPQ 78.

Also, see *Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Ortho-Peadics, Inc.* 24 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Here the court held that although the claims may be subsumed in a prior art reference generalized disclosure, this is not literal identity. The reference ranges were “so broad as to be meaningless” and provided no guidelines on how to construct a product with the invention’s attributes.

Furthermore, the cited references do not inherently disclose the present invention. For instance, see *In re Robertson, et al* 49 USPQ2d 1949 (1999 Fed. Cir.). In this case, Robertson filed a patent application concerning a paper diaper. The application claimed a paper diaper having (a) two fasteners so that the diaper could be worn on a baby and (b) a third fastener for rolling up and fixing the used diaper. The Patent Office rejected the invention under 35 USC 102 based on “Principles of Inherency” as the invention is “anticipation” by the prior art.

The prior art (Wilson) relied upon disclosed a diaper which had two snaps in front and back of the diaper in order to be worn by a baby and which may further have a strip in order to fasten the diaper to baby's body. Wilson describes that the used diaper can be easily dealt with by rolling up and fixing it with the snaps. Accordingly, the Patent Office considered that the diaper of Wilson inherently has an ability to be rolled up and fixed after use and decided that the claimed diaper is anticipated by the diaper of Wilson. The Federal Circuit; however, held that it is recognized that the constitution of the invention is inherently present in the prior art, only when it is clearly shown that the constitution of the invention is necessarily present in the prior art by external evidence. The invention can not be rejected based on "inherency" because of probability or possibility of the presence of the constitution in the prior art. Also see *Crown Operations International Ltd. V. Solutia* 24 USPQ 2d 1917 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

**B. Hoffarth et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,755,911 to Suzuki does not render obvious Claims 9, 10, 14 and 15.**

Claims 9, 10, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffarth et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,755,911 to Suzuki. Suzuki fails to overcome the above discussed deficiencies of Hoffarth with respect to rendering unpatentable the present claims.

Suzuki does not suggest an interposer comprising dielectric layers disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer as recited in these claims. Moreover, Suzuki does not relate to laminating subassemblies of the type to which the claims are directed. Instead, the layers 2, 3 and 4 in Suzuki are actually circuit boards not interposes between subassemblies. Also, Suzuki requires employing a porous, expanded polytetrafluoroethylene to bond the circuit boards together. Moreover, Suzuki requires adhesive dots to bond the PTFE, which is contrary to the objectives of the present invention.

Accordingly, even if, Suzuki were combined with Hoffarth, the present invention would still not be disclosed.

C. Hoffarth in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,788,766 to Burger, et al. does not render obvious Claim 17.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hoffarth in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,788,766 to Burger, et al. Burger, et al. was relied upon for a disclosure of laminating subassemblies employing temperatures of at least 155°C, a time of 15 minutes and a pressure of 125 psi.

Burger, et al. fail to overcome the above discussed deficiencies of Hoffarth with respect to rendering unpatentable the present invention. Therefore Claim 17 is patentable for at least those reasons as to why Claim 8 is patentable.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is abundantly clear that the Primary Examiner erred in finally rejecting claims 8-17. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Board reverse the Examiner and allow claims 8-17.

In the event the Examiner deems necessary any further cooperation to further the prosecution of this application, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fees to Deposit Account 22-0185.

Dated: 7-22-04

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Burton A. Amernick

Registration No.: 24,852

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036-3425

(202) 331-7111  
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)  
Attorneys for Applicant

## APPENDIX – CLAIMS ON APPEAL

8. A method for fabricating a laminate circuit structure assembly which comprises: providing at least two modularized circuitized voltage plane subassemblies wherein each of the subassemblies comprise at least two signal planes having an external and internal surface disposed about an internal voltage plane; providing dielectric between the signal and voltage planes; and providing dielectric on each external surface of each signal plane; and providing a non-cured or partially cured curable dielectric composition between the subassemblies wherein the dielectric composition comprises, the same dielectric used in said subassemblies, aligning the subassemblies, and then laminating to cause bonding of the subassemblies.

9. The method of Claim 8, which further comprises: locating an interposer between the subassemblies wherein the interposer comprises dielectric layers disposed about an internal electrically conductive layer.

10. The method of Claim 9, wherein dielectric of at least one of the surfaces that is to be bonded is from said dielectric composition.

11. The method of Claim 8, wherein vias are disposed within each subassembly for providing electrical communication between signal planes and electrical connection to another subassembly.

12. The method of Claim 11, wherein the vias through the signal planes are plated with a conductive metal.

13. The method of claim 11, wherein the vias are filled with conductive adhesive.

14. The method of Claim 9, wherein the internal electricity conductive layer of the interposer is copper.

15. The method of Claim 9, wherein the interposer is about 3 to about 10 mils thick.



16. The method of Claim 8, which comprises: providing top and bottom circuit layers on top and bottom external surfaces of the assembly.

17. The method of Claim 8, wherein the laminating is carried out at about 100 to about 200°C, for about 15 minutes to about 90 minutes, and at a pressure of about 100 to about 500 psi.